

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
at CHATTANOOGA

CHRISTINE CALDWELL, )  
                          )  
Plaintiff,             )  
                          )  
v.                      )                  Case No: 1:10-cv-38  
                          )                  *Collier / Lee*  
LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY OF        )  
NORTH AMERICA and ARRAY        )  
MARKETING GROUP HEALTH AND     )  
WELFARE PLAN,                 )  
                                  )  
Defendants.                 )

**ORDER**

Before the Court is an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (“Application”) [Doc. 1] filed by Plaintiff Christine Caldwell. Plaintiff’s Application provides the Court with insufficient information to find that she is indigent. On March 1, 2010, the Court ordered Plaintiff to submit within 21 days an explanation of her Application clarifying how she currently pays her monthly expenses [Doc. 3]. Plaintiff was cautioned that a failure to submit the requested information might result in the denial of her Application. Plaintiff did not submit any further documentation or averments supporting her Application, and the Court is still without sufficient information to determine that she is indigent. The threshold requirement a petitioner must meet in order to proceed *in forma pauperis* is to show, by affidavit, she is unable to pay court fees and costs. 28 U.S.C. §

1915(a). Because Plaintiff has not made that showing, I **RECOMMEND** Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* [Doc. 1] be **DENIED**.<sup>1</sup>

SO ORDERED.

ENTER:

s/Susan K. Lee  
SUSAN K. LEE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Any objections to this report and recommendation must be served and filed within 14 days after service of a copy of this recommended disposition on the objecting party. Such objections must conform to the requirements of Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Failure to file objections within the time specified waives the right to appeal the district court's order. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 n.7 (1985). The district court need not provide *de novo* review where objections to this report and recommendation are frivolous, conclusive and general. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986). Only specific objections are reserved for appellate review. *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987).